

10/624,263
67086-003**REMARKS**

Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lauzier (US 3,955,799). Further, claims 15, 16, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doublet (US 4,646,807) in view of Lauzier. Claims 15, 16, 29 and 30 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13, 14, 17-24, 26-28, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doublet in view of Bilby et al. (US 6,199,833). Amended claim 1 requires that the frame and bottom rail define a first side and a second side, and that the at least two hooks include an opening, and that each opening is opened to the first side and closed to the second side. Doublet includes two hooks that are attached to opposite sides of a rail member and open to opposite sides. Accordingly, the closed side of the Doublet hooks are closed on opposite sides of the rail and therefore cannot meet the limitations of amended claim 1.

Claim 17 has also been amended to require that the hooks open to the first side and are closed to the second side. Doublet does not disclose or suggest this limitation and therefore the proposed combination of Doublet and Bilby does not disclose all of the claim limitations. Accordingly, claims 1-5, 7-11, 13, 14, 17-24, 26-28, 32 and 33 are in allowable form.

Claims 25 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doublet in view of Bilby et al. as applied to claims 24 and 17 above, and further in view of Lauzier. Claims 25 and 31 ultimately depend from an allowable base claim and are therefore also allowable.

Claim 6 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant has done so.

Applicant has included new claims 34-36. Claim 34 is directed toward a method of assembling a barricade where a second vertical rail of a second frame assembly is rotated about a longitudinal axis parallel to a first vertical rail assembly of a first frame assembly and the second vertical rail of the second frame assembly is received within at least two hooks of the first frame assembly. The prior art requires tilting of one of the frame assemblies such that it rotates about an axis perpendicular to the other frames vertical rail. (Doublet, Figure 3b). Claim 35 requires moving one frame away from the other frame to seat second frame into the at least two hooks. Claim 36 requires that the securing of the at least two hooks such that the openings of each hook face in a first direction, and a closed end faces in a second direction opposite the first direction.


10/624,263
67086-003

The prior art discloses oppositely orientated hooks. The new claims are not discloses or suggested by the prior art.

Thus, claims 1-11, 13, 14, 17-28 and 31-36 are in condition for allowance. The Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482, in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds, P.C. \$100.00 for one additional independent claim in excess of three. No additional fees are seen to be required. If any additional fees are due, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482, in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds, P.C., for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment. Therefore, favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.



John M. Siragusa
Registration No. 46,174
400 West Maple Road, Suite 350
Birmingham, Michigan 48009
Telephone: (248) 988-8360
Facsimile: (248) 988-8363

Dated: October 26, 2005